



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,643	12/12/2001	Michael O. Thorne	033493-001	9752

21839 7590 01/18/2005

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

KAUFMAN, CLAIRE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/009,643	Applicant(s) THORNER ET AL.	
	Examiner Claire M Kaufman	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-17 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, 2, 3, 4 and 14, drawn to a ligand that binds and/or activates the GHRH receptor of SEQ ID NO:4, and a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:6 encoding a ligand.

Group II, claim(s) 5-7 and 15, drawn to a chicken GHRH receptor and encoding nucleic acid.

Group III, claim(s) 9-12, drawn to method of enhancing feed utilization or growth in an avian by administration of an agonist or antagonist, including a ligand, of the GHRH receptor of SEQ ID NO:4.

Group IV, claim(s) 13, drawn to method of enhancing feed utilization in an avian by administering a compound that up-regulates the expression of the GHRH receptor of SEQ ID NO:4.

Group V, claim(s) 16, drawn to a transgenic avian comprising a nucleic acid encoding a ligand of the GHRH receptor of SEQ ID NO:4.

Group VI, claim(s) 17, drawn to a transgenic avian comprising a nucleic acid encoding a chicken GHRH receptor.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

According to PCT Rule 13.2, unity of invention exists only when the shared same or corresponding technical feature is a contribution over the prior art. The inventions listed as Groups I and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept because of the lack of the same or corresponding special technical feature. The technical feature of Group I is a ligand that binds the chicken GHRH receptor of SEQ ID NO:4, which is shown by WO 98/32857 to lack

Art Unit: 1646

novelty or inventive step because of the teaching of a human GHRH (a.k.a. GRF, page 11, lines 25-29) which, according to the instant specification (page 14, lines 15-27), binds to the chicken GHRH (cGHRH) receptor of SEQ ID NO:4, and does not make it a contribution over the prior art.

According to PCT Rule 13.2, unity of invention exists only when there is a shared same or corresponding technical feature among the claimed inventions. All the groups are directed to a GHRH ligand, receptor or method of using the ligand or receptor or nucleic acid thereof, but each group has a different special technical feature not shared by the remaining groups. Group I is directed to a GHRH ligand, which has the special technical feature of being a ligand that binds and/or activates the GHRH receptor of SEQ ID NO:4, which is not shared by any of the remaining groups (see preceding paragraph for why special technical feature is not shared with methods using the ligand Group III). Group II is directed to a GHRH receptor which has the special technical feature of its structure and function, which is not shared by any of the remaining groups. Group IV is directed to a method of administering a compound which up-regulates expression of a GHRH receptor and is not the first methods and which has the special technical feature of different method steps and outcomes, which is not shared by any of the remaining groups. Group V is directed to a transgenic avian comprising a nucleic acid encoding a ligand of Group I, however, it has the special technical feature of being an avian comprising the particular nucleic acid, which is not shared by any of the remaining groups. Group VI is directed to a transgenic avian comprising a nucleic acid encoding a receptor of Group II, however, it has the special technical feature of being an avian comprising the particular nucleic acid, which is not shared by any of the remaining groups.

This Authority therefore considers that the several inventions do not share a special technical feature within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2 and thus do not relate to a single general inventive concept within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.1.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1646

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Claire M. Kaufman, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0873. Dr. Kaufman can generally be reached Monday, Tuesday and Thursday from 8:30AM to 2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached at (571) 272-0829.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Art Unit: 1646

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (571) 273-8300. NOTE: If applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by the applicant or applicant's representative. **NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED** so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office. **Please** advise the examiner at the telephone number above before facsimile transmission.

Claire M. Kaufman, Ph.D.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Claire M. Kaufman", written in dark ink.

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1646

January 13, 2005